

McGill reporter

VOLUME 2 NUMBER 18 10 FEBRUARY 1970

a yardstick	2	university grants: political hot potato	11
tables	4	formula financing	12
the council defends its formula	7	presentation by mcgill	13
mcgill brief: particular cases	7	bishop's university: preliminary brief	16
résumés to the conseil des universités	9		

THE 1970-71 UNIVERSITY OPERATING GRANTS PICTURE

It's that time again. The annual hustle for a fatter piece of the Quebec green stuff for university operating grants is in full swing. On January 29 both the universities and the general public were given a pretty fair idea as to how the pie is likely to be sliced in 1970-71. Unless the University Council can be persuaded to go back for another look, its recommendations to the Minister of Education will be something like the following:

	PROPOSED 1970-71	RECEIVED 1969-70
Bishops	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,551,000
Laval	26,600,000	34,381,000
McGill	28,200,000	22,849,000
U. of M.*	32,665,000	34,381,000
U. of Q.	42,000,000	18,000,000
Sherbrooke	10,400,000	8,742,000
Sir George	12,200,000	7,332,000
Total Grants	\$153,665,000	\$126,236,000

* University of Montreal figures include grants to Ecole Polytechnique and Hautes Etudes Commerciales.

Although the Council is recommending substantial boosts over last year all around, the universities all feel they should be getting more in order to meet rising costs and the effects of inflation. McGill, in particular, claims that it is being unfairly treated by the formula that produced the figures above. Its loudest beefs are over the grants per collegial student and the weight given to postgraduate students. There are also strong objections being raised by all of the universities about the threat of cutbacks to libraries, computer services, and community service programs. McGill is especially worried about its continuing education programs and several of the joint programs it has with its teaching hospitals.

While McGill has publicly attacked the Council's proposals and U. de M. and Laval have expressed unhappiness with what they are likely to get, Sir George and Bishop's on the English side have remained quiet. In the case of SGWU the reason for silence is obvious. Their grant is substantially increased over last year. Sir George's publication *Issues & Events* summed up that university's position this way: "Several of the other

universities protested bitterly at the effect of the new formula. Since it gives us an increase in our grant of more than 50 per cent over the current year, there was no question of SGWU lodging a protest. However, our representatives made a strong case for the special financial support we will need in the coming year, notably with regard to the renting of additional space."

In response to McGill's unhappiness about the effect of the new formula of January 16, the University Council staunchly defended its treatment of this university and has received strongly worded support from the Minister of Education and Dr. Roger Gaudry, Rector of the University of Montreal.

McGill bases its position largely on the fact that the original formula worked out by the Council (in this edition it is often referred to as the November 17 formula) treated McGill rather well. In fact, if it had not been revised the Council would have found itself in the politically awkward position of having to recommend to the Minister that McGill should receive \$33 million, with U. of M. and Laval both receiving lesser amounts. The new formula manages to trim McGill's grant by \$4.8 million, with SGWU losing \$2.2 million and Bishops dropping \$8 million. Grants to the French-speaking universities remained about the same under both formulas.

It should be noted that there is no commitment by the government to accept either the formula or its results. Both the formulas that have been discussed in the press were proposals of its subcommittee to the Council of Universities. The Council still has to make a report to the Minister, and that report has to be considered and accepted by the government. It will, therefore, probably be another two or three weeks before the final grants for 1970-71 are announced to the universities.

This Friday there is a meeting of the Council and McGill. It is understood, will have some suggestions to make about further revising the formula. Other universities undoubtedly will also be there seeking upward mobility on the part of the Council.

The Quebec Press has asked why McGill is complaining so loudly before the final decision is even made. McGill says the answer to this one is that the University was asked to voice its criticisms by the Council of Universities at this time so that they can be considered before the final recommendation: go to the Minister.

Another press criticism directed to McGill asks why McGill is unhappy when it is likely to get a 10 per cent increase. McGill's says this is inadequate because last year it received a 15 per cent decrease.

What must also be borne in mind is that the Council's proposals are only recommendations and the government is free to revise in whatever direction it wishes. It may, for example, feel that the total figure reached by the Council is too high and cuts will have to be made. However, one can speculate that the Council has functioned with some idea of what total figure the government would like to work with. Certainly, from a political point of view the government is quite happy to have the University Council set the guidelines for the grants. After all, isn't this precisely why the Council was established?

Whatever the final outcome, the operating grants situation is of great importance to the McGill community. The University has been operating with a substantial deficit during the past two years, and if things go along as they are academic programs will suffer. Faculty will face cut-backs and students will face still larger student: faculty ratios as well as feel the pinch of austerity all over the campus.

Moreover, the spiralling costs of higher education, confront all citizens with the agonizing question of how much we can afford. The Ontario Committee on University Affairs in a recent report to the government stated: "It is fairly easy to see how annual increments of well over 20 per cent may arise. It is not as easy to contemplate the compounding of such rates of increase in university grants over a span of several years."

This is a question that involves the professional educator, the prospective student, the future employer, and the tax-payer to equal degree.

University financing in Quebec is a particularly complicated business. To help shed some light on the present situation the McGill Reporter has decided to come out with this special edition. A note of warning should be raised, however, to the effect that a great deal of information was not available to us and in what we do have there are lots of conflicting figures floating around. This is

particularly so when it comes to adding up student enrollments.

In this issue, Vice-Principal Robert F. Shaw, who is McGill's representative on the University Council, outlines some of the background to the development of the Council and provides a commentary on the events leading up to the present grants proposals. An article by Harry Thomas, Editor of the Reporter takes a look at the political context for allocat-

ing operating monies to the universities. Free lance journalist Gloria Pierre examines formal financing as it applies to Quebec and Ontario. The issue also includes resumes of the arguments presented by six of the seven universities. The exception is Sir George which did not have a written brief up to press time. These were assembled by the McGill Reporter staff with the great assistance of free lance writer Luc Beauregarde.

The Editors

A YARDSTICK

by R. F. Shaw

Every year at about this time there is much talk about university grants for the ensuing year. And every year there is a flurry of statements by those involved or affected and much editorial comment.

There has previously been complaint that too many of the hearings to establish the amounts of grants have been held in camera. The Council of Universities has this year encouraged the Universities to comment on and criticize the proposed formulae as the work progresses, and has further suggested that the most recent meetings with the Universities be open to the public and to the mass media. Comment this year should, therefore, be better informed. Nevertheless, I feel that it might be useful if the McGill community and others were given some kind of a yardstick against which to measure the flood of public comment.

In writing this, however, there are two qualifications which must be borne in mind by the reader:

I am a member of the Council of Universities and should, therefore, avoid expressing opinions on subjects still under debate by the Council. However, I can inform the reader about those items of Council business which have been made public and documents released to the Universities in past years by the Gauthier Committee. I have also included certain figures from the current McGill financial statements and estimates. Secondly, I am a loyal employee and graduate of McGill University. I promise, therefore, to do my best, hereunder, to avoid personal opinion because of this conflict of interest.

Council of Universities

The Council of Universities was established by the Government of Quebec under Bill No. 57 "University Council Act" 1968.

The function of the Council is summarized in the "Explanatory Notes" as follows:

"This bill establishes the University Council, whose principal function will be to advise the Minister of Education regarding the needs of higher education and university research and to make recommendations to him regarding steps to be taken to meet such needs, including the amount of annual appropriations to be

made available for such purposes. It obliges the Minister to submit the principal steps he intends to take regarding the universities for the opinion of the Council. Such Council will consist of seventeen persons, one of whom will be a full-time president; it will be assisted by a University Research Commission, established under the bill, to advise the Council on any matter relating to university research."

The Council Membership is as follows:

Dr. Germain Gauthier,
President, Council of Universities

Mr. Clermont Gignac,
Student, Laval

Mr. Claude Piché,
Président de l'A.G.E.U.S.,
University of Sherbrooke.

Mr. Claude Geoffrion,
Président,
Commission de la réforme,
Université Laval.

Mr. René Hurtubise,
Vice-Recteur,
University of Quebec at Montreal.

Mr. André Desgagné,
Recteur,
University of Quebec at Chicoutimi.

Mr. Louis-Paul Dugal,
Vice-Recteur
University of Sherbrooke

Mr. Paul Lacoste,
Vice-recteur exécutif,
Université de Montréal

Dr. John O'Brien,
Principal,
Sir George Williams University

Mr. R. F. Shaw,
Vice Principal,
McGill University.

Maître François Chapados,
Avocat

Mr. André Gariépy,
Secretary and Director of Personnel,
La SAUVEGARDE

Mr. Jean-Guy Rodrigue,
President,
Fédération des ingénieurs et cadres,
C.S.N.

Mr. Fernand Toussaint,
Directeur du service pédagogique,
Corporation des enseignants du Québec.

Mr. Louis Z. Rousseau,
Directeur général,
Enseignement supérieur.

Mr. Denys de Belleval,
Directeur du Service de la recherche,
Direction générale
de l'enseignement supérieur

Mr. Ludovic Ouellet
Head of Chemistry Department,
Laval

Mr. Pierre Cazalis,
Secretary, Council of Universities

Currently the Council is devoting its attention to University budgets and subventions.

It has created two Sub-committees to aid in this task:

Expenditure Budgets and formulae:

Germain Gauthier, président
Claude Geoffrion
Jean L. Garneau
Gérald Gosselin
Gérald A. Martin
Marcel Masse
Michael Sheldon

Revenues:

R. F. Shaw, Chairman
André Desgagné
André Gariépy
Louis Z. Rousseau

Recent history of University grants

In recent years the Department of Education set up a committee to study and advise the Minister on University budgets and grants. This was known as the Gauthier Committee.

For the 1970-71 session the Council of Universities has taken over the function of the Gauthier Committee.

University grants — 1968-1969

University	Operating Grants recommended by the Gauthier Committee	Grant awarded by the Govt. of Quebec	Difference Increase or (Decrease)
Laval	\$22,161,000	\$22,816,000	655,000
University of Montreal Ecole Polytechnique)	29,349,000	28,616,000	(733,000)
Hautes Etudes Commerciales)			
Optometrie			
University of Sherbrooke	6,718,000	7,113,000	395,000
McGill University	21,133,000	18,858,000	(2,275,000)
Sir George Williams	6,463,000	5,969,000	(494,000)
Bishop's University	1,453,000	1,362,000	(91,000)

McGill University experienced a deficit of \$2,152,911.00 for the 1968-69 session.

University Grants — 1969-70

University	Operating Grants recommended by the Gauthier Committee	Grant awarded by the Govt. of Quebec	Difference Increase or (Decrease)
Laval	\$24,895,000	\$24,593,000	(302,000)
University of Montreal Ecole Polytechnique)	34,041,000	33,781,000	(260,000)
Hautes Etudes Commerciales)			
University of Sherbrooke	8,542,000	8,542,000	—
McGill University	25,445,000	22,475,000	(2,970,000)
Sir George Williams	7,792,000	7,332,000	(460,000)
Bishop's University	1,551,000	1,551,000	—

The cuts made by the government were based on minority reports to the Gauthier Committee protesting the establishment of grants on actual cost rather than on the operating grants awarded in 1968-69. No mention was made in the minority reports of the effects of the cuts which the Government had made to the Gauthier recommendations for 1968-69. The Government, however, accepted the principle of the minority reports, and penalized each university "75% du déficit 1968-69 non accepté".

Actually the 75% cuts were not strictly related to the deficits anticipated at that time, and McGill detected a technical error in the calculation and received thereby a commitment for an adjustment. I am not aware of any similar adjustments for other universities.

There were also special grants to encourage research in the francophone universities — totalling \$1,200,000.

The result was, therefore (as far as I know) the following:

Adjusted University grants — 1969-70

University	Operating Grants Recommended by Gauthier Comm.	Adjusted actual grants	Difference Increase or (Decrease)
Laval	\$24,895,000	\$24,993,000	98,000
University of Montreal Ecole Polytechnique)	34,041,000	34,381,000	340,000
Hautes Etudes Commerciales)			
University of Sherbrooke	8,542,000	8,742,000	200,000
McGill University	25,445,000	22,849,000	(2,596,000)
Sir George Williams	7,792,000	7,332,000	(460,000)
Bishop's University	1,551,000	1,551,000	—

There were special cases arising from unusual items totalling for all universities \$3,000,000.

Because of their special nature these figures are not included in the above tables.

Under this heading McGill had been instructed to charge a reduced fee for college equivalent students and was allotted a special grant to make up the difference \$ 523,000

Each medical school was allotted a special grant for intern and resident training 60,000

Total special grant to McGill \$ 583,000

With the above grants, McGill University currently estimates its 1969-70 deficit at \$2,600,000

I have not included the Université du Québec in the above tables as it was and is a new university which cannot be compared with the others. The University of Montreal, the Ecole Polytechnique and the Hautes Etudes Commerciales are actually separate institutions with certain common services and facilities. However, I have combined them in the figures above as I believe the results compare more easily with Laval and McGill where engineering and commerce are faculties integrated into the two universities.

Up to this point I have been discussing only operating grants but figures on the cost of operation per student are also necessary if the reader is to be able to measure efficiency against penalties for deficits. The universities have been attempting to develop a common method of counting students. There have been problems in arriving at the equivalent number of full-time students represented by the various types of part-time students.

By 1969-70 I believe the methods of counting had been sufficiently standardized to make comparisons meaningful. Not all universities have published their current forecasts of financial results at the end of the 1969-70 session. However, the figures released during the meetings to establish the operating grants for 1969-70 are sufficiently close to give a useful comparison.

University	Cost per full time equivalent student 1969-70	Source
Laval	\$2,835	Gauthier reports Feb. — Mar. 1969 Corrected for actual number of students. This figure will be increased if the Univ. faces a deficit
University of Montreal Ecole Polytechnique)	2,801	" " "
Hautes Etudes Commerciales)		
McGill	2,386	Current estimate including deficit
An Ontario University	3,083	" " "

I have obtained the figure from the above-noted Ontario University which prefers not to be identified. However, it is comparable with the three major Quebec universities and its treasury department has been kind enough to calculate the cost per student for me on the same basis as is used in Quebec.

Finally it should be noted that unlike many States and Provinces in North America, the Government of Quebec has, until now, deducted voluntary support (given for general operating purposes) from budgeted expenditures before calculating the amounts of the operating grants.

The result at McGill has been the withdrawal of some private gifts and the redirection of some gifts to non-operating items. For 1969-70 it is estimated that the amount of private support appropriated from McGill by the Government will be \$2,690,000.

The 1970-71 Budgeting Operation

The Council of Universities set up a Sub-committee to work on Operating Budgets for 1970-71.

This committee produced a report based on a formula approach and dated November 17, 1969.

The Universities were requested to prepare submissions based on this formula and to present their comments and criticisms at a meeting in Quebec on December 11, 1969.

The Committee then prepared a revised report and formula dated January 16, 1970.

The Council of Universities was not prepared to accept the recommendations of this second report immediately but it did send out Tables Nos. I, II, IX, Xa and Xb from the report indicating the new formula proposed by the Sub-committee and asking for comment in a telegram to the universities dated January 23, 1970.

The telegram read as follows:

le 23 janvier 1970

Avant que le Conseil des universités ne prenne position sur l'avis à donner au ministre de l'Education au sujet des budgets et des subventions 1970-71, il désire recevoir la semaine prochaine vos commentaires sur les sujets suivants:

- 1) une formule de subvention de base dont les données présentement étudiées vous sont transmises aujourd'hui 23 janvier,
- 2) les modalités permettent de tenir compte de la répartition linguistique provinciale dans les subventions gouvernementales en vue d'atteindre une parité dans la qualité et la quantité des services universitaires dans les deux secteurs linguistiques,
- 3) le passage gradué d'une année à l'autre, au point de vue des budgets et des subventions,
- 4) le niveau collégial en voie de transition et de disparition sur les campus universitaires,
- 5) l'ajustement des subventions pour tenir compte des effectifs réels par rapport aux prévisions,
- 6) les traitements et les masses salariales des enseignants,
- 7) les subventions de recherche,
- 8) les nouveaux programmes prévus pour septembre 1970,
- 9) les situations non prévues par la formule, y compris l'émergence,
- 10) tout autre sujet que vous voudriez soumettre au Conseil.

Germain GAUTHIER, PRÉSIDENT
CONSEIL DES UNIVERSITÉS

Basically the formula proposed in the report of January 16, 1970 differed from the formula of November 17, 1969 in two respects:

(a) In calculating teaching costs, college equivalent students were removed from most formula items and covered only by a lump sum per student of \$1,000.00 (well under one half of the average cost of a university student)
Less the fees collected 375.00
Operating grant per college equivalent student \$ 625.00

(b) In calculating the number of teaching staff required there was a formula on November 17, 1969 which recognized a significantly lower student: staff ratio for the second and third (or post graduate) cycles than for the first (or Bachelor) cycle.

The January 16, 1970 formula called for a 13 students: 1 staff ratio across the board. The effect of these two changes was to lower the operating grants for any university which had a high number of college equivalent students and a high number of second and third cycle students.

The following table is, therefore, presented:
Forecast 1970-71 Full-time Equivalent Students

University	College Equivalent	1st Cycle	2nd & 3rd Cycle	Total
Laval	593	10,666	1,628	12,887
University of Montreal)				
Ecole Polytechnique)	211	13,656	2,791	16,658
Hautes Etudes				
University of Sherbrooke	75	4,555	772	5,402
McGill University	3,989	8,616	3,779	16,384
Sir George Williams	4,414	5,525	388	10,327
Bishop's University	678	623	96	1,397

At the suggestion of the Council each University invited observers and the press to be present to hear comments and criticism of the Formula of January 16, 1970.
The telegram of January 23, 1970 was

received by some universities as late as January 26, 1970 and the meetings with the Council took place on January 28, 29 and 30, 1970.
The tables were distributed on January 23, 1970 but were not exhaustive in their information.

Therefore: —
Two universities did not present written briefs
Most universities would have "smoothed out" their documents if they had had more time

McGill deduced certain figures which differed from the corresponding figures in the full (undistributed) report of January 16, 1970.
It was my impression that there was general agreement among the universities that:
rattrapage and special support for emerging universities should be continued until

there was equal opportunity for all qualified applicants to the universities.
rattrapage and austerity should not result in the deterioration of the existing universities

not enough importance was given in the formula to libraries, computers and audio visual teaching methods.

Other criticisms and comments varied depending on the effects of the formulae on the individual universities.
What now

The Council will meet again to prepare its recommendations on operating budgets.
The report of the Sub-committee on revenues has been received but not yet considered.
There will probably be one more meeting with the Universities before the exercise is completed.
Thereafter the Council of Universities will tackle the capital budgets for 1969-70.

TABLES

UNIVERSITÉS	Tableau I ÉTUDIANTS RÉGULIERS À TEMPS PLEIN										
	1970 - 71										
	Disciplines dites "sèches"				Disciplines dites "humides"						
	Niveau collégial	Total 1er cycle	2e et 3e cycles	Sous-total	Niveau collégial	Total 1er cycle	1er cycle médecine seulement Sc. fond. Sc. clin.		2e et 3e cycles	Sous-total	Total
Université Laval	125	5,997	935	7,057	20	3,548	400	350	551	4,119	11,176
Université de Montréal		4,965	1,840	6,805	140	4,370	410	220	503	5,013	11,818
Hautes Études Commerciales		1,293	25	1,318							1,318
École Polytechnique						1,655			197	1,852	1,852
Université de Sherbrooke		2,346	524	2,870		1,500	163	92	248	1,748	4,618
Université du Québec: total	217	5,876	54	6,147		1,402				1,402	7,549
Montréal (2)		3,755		3,755		590				590	4,345
Trois-Rivières	217	1,186	44	1,447		352				352	1,799
Chicoutimi		572	10	582		360				360	942
Rimouski		363		363		100				100	433
Université Bishop's	463	503	58	1,024	215	107			10	332	1,336
Université McGill	1,744	4,199	1,745	7,688	2,136	3,910	260	245	1,881	7,927	15,615
Université Sir Geo. Williams	1,950	2,008	131	4,089	860	860			50	1,770	5,859
TOTAL	4,499	27,187	5,312	36,998	3,371	17,352	1,233	907	3,440	24,163	61,161

UNIVERSITÉS	Tableau II ÉTUDIANTS RÉGULIERS À TEMPS PLEIN ÉQUIVALENT										
	1970-71										
	Disciplines dites "sèches"				Disciplines dites "humides"						Total
	Niveau collégial	Total 1er cycle	2e et 3e cycles	Sous-total	Niveau collégial	Total 1er cycle	1er cycle médecine seulement Sc. fond. Sc. clin.		2e et 3e cycles	Sous-total	
Université Laval	548	7,019	1,053	8,620	45	3,647	400	350	575	4,267	12,887
Université de Montréal	71	6,081	1,970	8,122	140	4,500	410	220	520	5,160	13,283
Hautes Études Commerciales		1,419	30	1,449							1,440
École Polytechnique						1,656			271	1,927	1,927
Université de Sherbrooke	43	2,979	524	3,546	32	1,576	163	92	248	1,856	5,402
Université du Québec: total	2,014	7,338	74	9,426		1,557				1,557	10,983
Montréal (2)	1,100	4,200		5,300		654				654	5,954
Trois-Rivière	914	1,716	47	2,677		402				402	3,979
Chicoutimi		752	27	779		381				381	1,160
Rimouski		670		670		120				120	890
Université Bishop's	463	515	86	1,064	215	108			10	333	1,327
Université McGill	1,852	4,659	1,867	8,378	2,137	3,957	260	245	1,912	8,006	16,384
Université Sir Geo. Williams	3,221	4,129	233	7,583	1,193	1,396			155	2,744	10,327
TOTAL	8,212	34,139	5,837	48,188	3,762	18,397	1,233	907	3,691	25,850	74,038

	TABLEAU IX ÉVOLUTION DES RÈGLES D'ANALYSE								
	Règles 1969-70			Formule 17 novembre 1969			Formule 16 janvier 1970		
	collégial	1er cycle	2-3e cycles	collégial	1er cycle	2-3e cycles	collégial (1)	1er cycle	2-3e cycles
ENSEIGNEMENT (MOINS MÉDECINE)									
Rapport Étudiants/Professeur	Accroissement d'étudiants (4 ans)			15:1	12:1	Excédent 5:1		13:1	13:1
Masse salariale	Acc. = 7.5%			3 hypothèses: 6% - 10% - 14%				Idem	
Nouveaux professeurs									
Taux	\$8,325.00			\$9,175.00				Idem	
Acc. en % sur l'année antérieure	4.8%			10%				Idem	
FACULTÉS DE MÉDECINE									
Rapport Étudiants/Professeur									
Sciences fondamentales					12:1	Excédent 5:1		13:1	13:1
Sciences cliniques	/Acc. Étudiants/professeur 5/1				1.5:1			1.5:1	
Masse salariale	- comme pour les autres facultés -								
Nouveaux professeurs									
Taux	\$9,400.00 (sans P.T. Géog.)			\$13,200.00 (P.T. Géog. inclus)				Idem	
Acc. en % sur l'année antérieure	4.8%			10%				Idem	
AVANTAGES SOCIAUX	7.3% Enseignants 8% autres (8% annuel)			7.3% Enseignants (8% annuel)				Idem	
AUTRES DÉPENSES D'ENSEIGNEMENT	En cours + 10% + Audio-V. + personnel			\$290./E. Fac. sèches-\$850./E. Fac. hum.				Idem	
BIBLIOTHÈQUE	\$90./E.	\$180./E.	\$270./E.	\$96./E.	\$196./E.	\$288./E.		\$200./E.	\$300./E.
INFORMATIQUE	\$40./E.	\$40./E.	\$40./E.	\$23./E.	\$45./E.	\$45./E.		\$50./E.	\$50./E.
ADMINISTRATION	En cours + 3.5%			Courbe de coût marginal				Idem avec minimum à \$110./E.	
TERRAINS & BÂTIMENTS	En cours + 5.0%			\$1.22/pied carré brut				Idem minimum \$200./E. maximum \$305./E.	
SERVICES AUX ÉTUDIANTS	\$22./E.			\$25./E.				Idem	
(1) Dans la formule du 16 janvier 1970, les étudiants de niveau collégial sont évalués à un coût de \$1,000.00 et à une subvention de \$625.00 per capita.									

(1) Dans la formule du 16 janvier 1970, les étudiants de niveau collégial sont évalués à un coût de \$1,000.00 et à une subvention de \$625.00 per capita.

Tableau X a						
UNIVERSITÉS DU QUÉBEC						
Budget de fonctionnement 1970-71						
Sommaire du calcul de la subvention de base selon la formule						
proposée le 17 novembre et révisée le 15 décembre 1969 et le 14 janvier 1970.						
	Laval	Montréal	H.E.C.	Polytechnique	Sherbrooke	Bishop's
Divers						
Activités périun. et serv. pop. **	83.9	76.3	56.3	7.2	15.1	0.7
Services rendus à l'extérieur **	37.2			9.5	2.5	
Revenus de scolarité de l'enseignement:	6,420.5	6,217.5	615.2	825.9	2,508.9	596.8
Revenus des droits d'affiliation:	126.2	65.0			0.5	
Revenus nets des dons reçus à des fins générales et particulières d'exploitation:	65.0	101.3		3.0	1.0	
Revenus nets de dotations:	110.0	72.0				
Intérêts réalisés sur placements:	130.0	100.0	20.0		2.0	140.0
Subventions d'opérations du gouv. fédéral:				24.5	50.0	9.0
Subventions provenant de ministères autre que l'Éducation:	60.0	810.0				
Total des revenus:	7,032.8	7,441.9	691.5	870.1	2,580.0	746.5
Dépenses						
Enseignement: (autres que médecine)						
Masse salariale du pers. ens.:	12,504.0	11,131.1	824.1	2,376.9	3,589.1	798.6
Nouveaux professeurs:	512.8	1,474.0	547.5		1,181.3	
Faculté de médecine:					847.0	
Masse salariale du pers. ens.	1,468.8	2,432.4				
Nouveaux professeurs:	2,006.4					
Avantages sociaux	1,203.9	1,097.7	100.3	173.5	410.0	58.3
Autres dépenses d'enseignement:	5,929.6	6,601.8	420.2	1,638.0	2,566.2	274.6
Total des dépenses d'enseignement:	23,625.5	22,737.0	1,894.1	4,188.4	8,593.6	1,131.5
Bibliothèque:	2,617.0	2,863.2	292.8	412.5	1,142.6	153.4
Informatique:	614.7	653.6	72.5	96.4	266.4	36.0
Administration:	2,078.3	2,163.8	348.0	460.8	1,181.9	174.0
Terrains et bâtiments:	3,930.5	4,028.4	289.8	587.8	1,647.6	324.0
Services aux étudiants:	307.4	326.8	36.2	48.2	133.2	18.0
Étudiants équivalents de niveau collégial aux \$800.	474.4	168.8			60.0	542.4
Total des dépenses	33,647.0	32,941.6	2,933.4	5,794.1	13,025.3	2,379.3
Subvention de base 1970-71	26,615.0	25,499.7	2,241.9	4,924.0	10,445.3	1,632.8
de la masse salariale:	160.8	149.6	13.4	23.2	54.8	7.8
Note: Le poste d'enseignement pour la constituante de Rimouski est sujet à changement, étant donné que nous n'avons pas les données nécessaires pour vérifier les montants apparaissant ici. Ne comprend pas le Centre d'études de transition. Montants représentant 10% des coûts directs; ne tenant pas compte du coût des plein temps géographiques. Section générale de l'Enseignement supérieur. 3 janvier 1970.						

Tableau X b							
Universités du Québec							
McGill	Sir Geo. W.	Chicoutimi	Montréal	Rimouski	Trois-Rivières	Total	Total
139.3	389.4	14.1	14.8		6.6	35.5	803.5
150.0	21.4						220.6
7,725.1	4,919.5	526.4	2,800.7	331.4	1,229.7	4,888.2	34,717.6
		28.2				28.2	219.9
253.6	5.0						428.9
1,860.0							2,042.0
	60.0						452.0
280.0	12.0						375.5
							870.0
10,408.0	5,407.3	568.7	2,815.5	331.4	1,236.3	4,951.9	40,130.0
13,795.2	4,843.9	1,123.9	4,362.2	607.2	1,637.2	7,730.5	57,593.4
	1,81.3	64.1	210.6	163.3		438.0	5,336.9
2,349.6							7,097.8
316.8							2,323.2
1,201.7	439.8	86.7	333.8	56.3	119.5	596.3	5,821.5
6,881.2	2,583.3	549.8	1,773.9	296.3	655.9	3,275.9	30,170.8
24,544.5	9,048.3	1,824.5	6,680.5	1,123.1	2,412.6	12,040.7	107,803.6
2,856.9	1,221.4	232.0	970.8	158.0	320.8	1,681.6	13,241.4
619.8	295.7	58.0	242.7	39.5	79.1	419.3	3,074.4
2,189.5	1,287.3	280.0	1,093.7	191.2	379.4	1,944.3	11,727.9
4,998.9	2,065.4	232.0	1,190.8	158.0	405.8	1,986.6	19,859.0
	147.8	29.0	121.4	19.8	39.6	209.8	1,537.3
3,191.2	3,531.3		880.0		173.6	1,053.6	9,021.6
38,610.7	17,597.1	2,655.5	11,179.9	1,689.6	3,810.9	19,335.9	166,265.2
28,202.7	12,189.8	2,086.8	8,364.4	1,358.2	2,574.6	14,384.0	126,135.2
160.6	58.8	11.6	44.6	8.3	16.0	80.5	709.5

THE COUNCIL DEFENDS ITS FORMULA OF JAN. 16

The following is a press release issued by the University Council on February 2.

Le Conseil des universités du Québec a rencontré les représentants de chacun des établissements universitaires au cours de la semaine dernière, en vue d'étudier leurs prévisions budgétaires de fonctionnement pour l'année 1970-71. Avec l'autorisation ou à la demande des universités, un certain nombre de journalistes ont assisté à ces rencontres. Le Conseil favorise ces audiences publiques, mais à la suite de malentendus et d'erreurs rapportés dans les journaux, le Conseil veut dès maintenant rétablir quelques faits.

Fonction du Conseil

Le Conseil des universités a pour fonction de conseiller le ministre de l'Éducation sur tous les aspects du développement de l'enseignement supérieur. En ce qui concerne plus spécifiquement les questions financières, il doit:

Suggérer au ministre les normes à adopter relativement à la standardisation des méthodes comptables des établissements d'enseignement supérieur;

Étudier les budgets annuels de fonctionnement et d'investissements des établissements d'enseignement supérieur;

Recommander le montant des crédits annuels à dégager pour fins de subvention aux établissements d'enseignement supérieur ainsi que leur répartition.

Provenant des universités, du monde du travail et des affaires, de même que du gouvernement, les membres du Conseil agissent à titre personnel et n'y interviennent pas au nom de leurs employeurs respectifs.

Pour mieux situer ici le rôle du Conseil en matière budgétaire, il est bon de rappeler que l'analyse des budgets universitaires de 1970-71, à laquelle il a procédé depuis plus de deux mois, fera très bientôt l'objet d'une recommandation. Celle-ci n'engagera pas le ministre de l'Éducation ni le gouvernement. S'il y a lieu, les contre-propositions du gouvernement seront ensuite examinées par le Conseil; après quoi, le gouvernement prendra la décision finale quant aux subventions à accorder aux universités en 1970-71. Dans l'analyse à laquelle s'est livré jusqu'ici le Conseil, le gouvernement n'est en aucune façon intervenu, puisque le Conseil compte soumettre ses pre-

mières recommandations au ministre de l'Éducation vers le 16 février prochain.

Formule de Financement

Afin d'en arriver à des normes de financement des établissements d'enseignement supérieur, le Conseil s'est attaché à la mise au point d'une FORMULE DE FINANCEMENT. Une formule est un moyen mécanique de déterminer de façon uniforme les besoins de base des établissements et de fixer l'enveloppe des subventions de base correspondantes, laissant à chaque établissement l'autorité de définir ses priorités et d'attribuer les ressources disponibles.

L'élaboration d'une formule par le Conseil des universités a conduit à deux hypothèses de travail: la seconde, proposée pour examen le 16 janvier, tenait compte des avis donnés par les universités lors d'une réunion de travail tenue le 11 décembre 1969, au cours de laquelle avait été soumis un avant-projet de formule conduisant à une première hypothèse de subventions de base pour 1970-71. Contrairement aux affirmations parues dans certains journaux, la formule du 17 novembre, de même que celle du 16 janvier, ne sont donc que des hypothèses de travail et non des formules définitives; elles ont été élaborées par le Conseil et non par le gouvernement, qu'elles n'engageaient en aucune façon.

La révision de la première hypothèse a été consécutive:

A une meilleure évaluation des coûts de l'enseignement de niveau collégial, inférieurs à ceux de l'universitaire, même lorsque cet enseignement est dispensé dans les cadres d'une université;

Aux avis formulés par les universités lors de la réunion du 11 décembre.

La seconde hypothèse de financement de base, ou formule révisée, présentée aux universités le 16 janvier, a fait l'objet d'interprétations erronées de la part de certains établissements:

1) elle fera l'objet d'une dernière évaluation avant présentation au gouvernement: il est donc faux de la considérer comme la recommandation finale du Conseil au gouvernement;

2) la plupart des établissements ont jugé insuffisantes les subventions suggérées par

la formule pour 1970-71: or, ils n'ont généralement pris en considération que la subvention de base, négligeant les subventions recevables au titre de situations particulières, qui ne peuvent être incluses dans des règles communes; il est ainsi prévu qu'environ 15 pour-cent des subventions pourraient être distribués à ce titre pour la formation de chercheurs, le perfectionnement des enseignants, la location de bâtiments, l'émergence d'établissements ou de programmes d'enseignement, les presses universitaires, etc.

Dans tous les cas, les subventions de base suggérées par la formule devraient être supérieures à celles de 1969-70, particulièrement dans le cas de l'Université McGill qui a le plus fortement déploré l'insuffisance de cette formule en se fondant sur l'hypothèse de travail provisoire du 17 novembre, dans laquelle elle a voulu voir une formule définitive de financement.

Mises au point

Le Conseil des universités tient enfin à rétablir les faits quant à des questions abordées dans divers articles de presse au cours des derniers jours.

Il est exact que le Conseil a posé comme objectif la recherche d'une parité des services offerts aux étudiants des deux secteurs linguistiques du Québec; il en a d'ailleurs saisi les universités. Toutefois, aucune proposition spécifique n'a encore été faite quant aux modalités et au calendrier de réalisation de cette parité. Ceux-ci feront l'objet, le moment venu, d'une analyse poussée en vue de critères objectifs discutés publiquement.

Enfin, le Conseil déplore vivement qu'un journal anglophone ait relié la prétendue baisse des subventions aux universités de langue anglaise aux discussions qui se sont déroulées à l'occasion du dépôt du projet de loi numéro 63. Il considère cette assertion comme sans fondement et réaffirme que la réévaluation de sa formule de financement, entre novembre et janvier, s'inspire de critères purement techniques.

D'ailleurs, le Conseil prévoit recommander dans tous les cas, pour 1970-71, y compris ceux des universités anglophones, des subventions nettement accrues par rapport à celles de 1969-70.

McGILL UNIVERSITY BRIEF

Particular cases not covered by Formula Approach

University Press

To broaden the programme and yet to reduce its cost to the individual partners McGill and Queen's University have combined to establish

the McGill-Queen's University Press. Each university is committed to pay a subsidy of 50% of the loss sustained on this non-profit activity. McGill's share of this subsidy cost for 1970-71 is \$70,000. Its actual cost in

1968-69 was \$105,640. University Presses were an acceptable item in the portion of the Gauthier Committee allocation for "Correctifs Recommandés" for 1969-70.

Supplementary Pensions

McGill University is committed to paying supplementary pensions to personnel who have retired and whose pensions from the funded, regular pension plan fall below a certain minimum requirement. These are specific payments to specific individuals. Our cost for this item in 1970-71 will be \$337,000. The "Correctif Recommandes" for 1969-70 was \$325,000.

Buildings and Grounds

The problem of bringing all of the factors (usage, age of buildings, campus distribution, etc.) into consideration when establishing an equitable per gross square foot allowance or formula has already been discussed in the meeting at Quebec on December 11, 1969. Special consideration is warranted however in certain cases:

Security

Based on the need for providing increased security coverage on a 24-hour, 7-day week, we are also faced with periodic events such as "Operation McGill" (Cost \$50,000 +), police strike, October 7, 1969, (damage \$30,000 +), bombing, November 30, 1969 (\$5,000 +). We estimate our increase in security costs for 1970-71 will be of the order of \$200,000 and this should be provided over and above the regular building and ground allocation.

Maintenance of grounds

This expense is unrelated to the operating costs of buildings themselves for which a formula can be used and should also be considered as a special case. Our budget request for this expense for 1970-71 is \$131,000.

Museums

Lyman Entomological Museum

Located at Macdonald College contains a valuable insect collection second only in Canada to the national collection in Ottawa.

McCord Museum

Located in the old University Centre on Sherbrooke Street with an extensive collection of pictures, documents and objects of historical, sociological and anthropological interest.

Redpath Museum

Of natural history contains close to ¾ of a million zoological and geological specimens.

All of the museums noted above have some research and teaching function but the main activity is a service to the public of Montreal and are kept open weekends for this purpose. Visits to the displays of the Redpath Museum, particularly, are a part of the regular curriculum of most schools in the Montreal area.

The McGill budget for its museums is \$263,000 for 1969-70 and they have requested \$317,000 for 1970-71.

University Planning Office

There is a continually increasing demand for better information from within the university on which to base decisions involving the allocation of scarce resources. From the government there is an increasing number of requests for information. These requests end up

more and more in the University Planning Office as it begins to accumulate various forms of basic data about the University. The increase in the budget for planning, since the formation of the Office of Research for Planning and Development in 1966-67,

1966-67	— \$ 21,900
1967-68	— \$ 22,420
1968-69	— \$ 38,580
1969-70	— \$ 79,620
1970-71	— \$110,660

is an indication of the increasing demands for information. It is likely that this increase will continue and indeed it is reasonable to expect that the budget for this sort of office might easily be ½ of 1% of the operating budget of the University.

Costs of Bilingualism

In addition to significant increases in the budget of the French Department (Faculty of Arts and Science) to support a programme of Functional French throughout the University, of subsidized staff courses in French, increased language laboratory facilities, etc., the University faces significant costs for a planned expansion of bilingualism throughout its operation.

Translation Office

We now have 4 full-time translators on staff for general assignments at an annual cost of \$30,000.

Staff Objections

It is university policy to place bilingual personnel (a) in each area of the university dealing with the public, and (b) in all departments of size to have at least one bilingual person to assist in non-technical translation.

Our salary policy calls for a premium to be paid to such personnel of about \$400 on the average. Since we have at least 250 of our staff who qualify for this premium, and the number is growing, there is an extra cost of \$100,000 for this reason alone.

Special French Instruction for Students and Staff

Situated in Quebec, where the language of the majority is French, McGill must make available courses in conversational French for both students and staff who wish to be able to work in that language. When the policies expressed in Bill 63 have been implemented, it may be expected that the schools will, for Quebec Anglophone students, have provided these language skills. In the meanwhile, it is an obligation for an anglophone University like McGill to provide extensive special programmes.

Such programmes have been provided for staff since. They are well attended and have produced significant improvement in language skills. The cost of an expanded programme for 1971-72 will be \$38,730.

For students, a pilot course in "functional French" has been in operation for two years. It will be expanded greatly in 1970-1971 through the use of competent students as well as teaching staff as instructors. It will cost \$58,600.

The University and the Community

Large, modern universities inevitably have an impact on the community in which they are situated.

The land they occupy is tax-exempt; their staff and students, who live in the community, affect its social and economic life. Many parts of North America, like the Boston area and the San Francisco Bay area, have seen new industries grow up as a consequence of the pool of scientific and technological skills that universities provide. Universities ignore their relations with their communities at their peril. Town versus gown tensions are a well-known phenomenon, and they can reach explosive proportions, as in the recent case of Columbia University and Riverside Park, if they are neglected. University activities that show concern for community problems and express in a sensitive way the university's willingness to assist disadvantaged groups in the community, however, can transform resentments into respect.

The community is also a resource for the university in both its teaching and research. The student's development at University can be substantially strengthened if he becomes directly aware of, and actively involved in, what he is studying, whether it be medicine, psychology or law. Contact with the community lends reality to a wide range of academic studies.

Dr. Robertson recently summed up McGill's reasons for supporting projects, such as medical clinics, a legal aid clinic and hospital-based social mental health programs, that bring university students and staff into the community:

"There are two objectives that must be kept in mind. One is to conduct pilot experiments of this nature to assist Governments on the professions in setting up regular facilities. The other is to find some genuine way of creating out of these efforts a teaching medium that could have real value. Both of these are sufficiently likely to some about that it is, I believe, very worthwhile to encourage developments of this sort."

The McGill Program

The Pointe St. Charles Clinic of Montreal Student Health Organization.

The Clinic was established in 1968 to provide medical services in the low income area. It was an initiative of medical students, supported by staff.

Since last year, it has also engaged in an educational program involving:

- Remedial reading tutoring for children in Kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2. The major work is being done by 27 students enrolled in Psychology 451.
- A Study Centre where children do homework under supervision and where a library has been created with assistance from the Montreal Children's library. Students work with the Citizen's association of Pointe St. Charles.

- A teen-age program working through the study centre.

The Jeanne Mance Clinic

A free medical clinic for disoriented young people, sixteen to twenty-three, many of whom have run away from home and are alienated from the community. Medical check-ups, drug

therapy, psycho-analytical consultation and dieting advice are available.

Mental Health

Volunteers are used by the Douglas Hospital, the Allan Memorial Hospital, the Montreal Children's Hospital, the Family Service Centre, in various rehabilitation programs. A social therapeutic centre has been established in Verdun, and a program to aid prisoners and ex-prisoners is being worked out in conjunction with St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.

Legal Aid Clinic

An initiative of Law Faculty Students that will soon be operative.

Structures

The McGill Community Program was created this year by the Students Council to supervise all community action by students and it works in close collaboration with the Montreal Student Health Organization (Pointe St. Charles Clinic) set up earlier by medical students.

The University has created through its Academic Policy Committee a Sub-Committee on Community Programs to:

1. co-ordinate the various programs within McGill
2. facilitate contacts with community programs at other universities
3. study the educational and academic implications of these programs for curriculum, a credit system and student evaluation and propose guidelines in this respect
4. provide a framework for the empirical assessment of the validity and usefulness of such programs
5. receive and recommend for approval new projects which might be part of a university program

Costs

This year the University contributed \$13,000 toward the \$20,000 costs of these projects. Next year, a total cost of \$30,000 is expected.

Centre for Learning and Development

Universities increasingly are recognizing the need for devoting intensive attention to improvements in teaching and the study and application of new learning methods.

Last year, McGill created the Centre for Learning and Development to encourage and aid reform and innovation in teaching and learning. Its budget last year was \$60,000. For 1970-71 it will be \$120,000.

The Centre is located in the Department of Psychology, but has a university-wide function.

In addition, the University created last year a special \$100,000 fund to finance specific experiments in new teaching methods.

Innovations will include:

Improved use of audio-visual aids including T.V.

Development of computer-assisted learning systems

Experiments in student participation

Course re-design.

RÉSUMÉS PRESENTED TO THE CONSEIL DES UNIVERSITÉS

Université du Québec

Dans un mémoire de 16 pages adressé le 30 janvier 1970 au Conseil des universités, l'Université du Québec affirme que seul un programme de subventions spéciales au titre de l'"émergence" en sus de subventions de base lui permettra de faire face à ses obligations.

"L'Université du Québec, ajoute le recteur, M. Alphonse Riverin, présente des "cas particuliers" en raison de sa nature, de sa dispersion géographique et administrative, de son "héritage" des institutions préalables et de sa création récente."

Le Conseil des universités établit à \$19,335,900 le budget de fonctionnement de l'Université du Québec et à \$14,384,000 le montant de sa subvention de base.

"Sans l'apport d'une subvention spéciale au titre de l'émergence, déclare le mémoire, la subvention de base que vous proposez n'est supérieure que de \$100,000 ou 7/10 de 1% par rapport à la subvention reçue l'an dernier alors que notre clientèle devrait augmenter de près de 25% en 1970.

"De plus, les budgets 1969-70 de l'université du Québec prévoyaient les traitements des professeurs sur une base de 9 mois alors que ceux de 1970 les prévoient sur 12; de plus, la formule de base propose que la subvention par étudiant des constituantes passe de \$1,475 en 1969 à \$1,300 en 1970."

L'université du Québec se dit d'accord sur le principe de la répartition des subventions suivant les proportions linguistiques et sur le calendrier de 5 ans proposé.

Elle croit cependant que le taux de subvention (\$625 par étudiant) proposé pour les étudiants du niveau collégial ne tient pas compte du fait que l'Université du Québec a "hérité" de ces clientèles des institutions préalables

et qu'elle a eu peu de temps pour s'ajuster à ces nouveaux coûts de fonctionnement.

L'Université du Québec fait valoir ses besoins spéciaux sous plusieurs rubriques.

Siège social

Les impératifs de la coordination des politiques et des initiatives de chacune des unités autonomes à l'intérieur de l'Université du Québec nécessitent un personnel plus nombreux. Le siège social est un service des constituantes mais ne les gère pas, de sorte que son coût ne peut strictement être imputé aux dépenses d'administration des seules universités constituantes suivant un taux basé sur le nombre des étudiants.

Enseignement

Un rapport professeur/étudiant (pondérés) de 1 à 11 a été utilisé pour chaque constituante pour déterminer le nombre de postes, auxquels ont été ajoutés ½ professeur par "module".

"Nous croyons qu'un rapport professeur/étudiant plus généreux que la norme de financement proposée par le conseil (1/13) est nécessaire pour permettre à l'Université du Québec d'offrir des programmes de qualité à des groupes encore restreints d'étudiants qui s'inscrivent dans les dernières années du 2ème. Quant au ½ professeur par module, cette provision correspond aux besoins exprimés par les directeurs de modules d'être libérés de la moitié de leur charge d'enseignement afin de se consacrer aux tâches administratives et d'encadrement d'étudiants que comporte la structure modulaire."

Administration

Ces dépenses présentent un cas particulier en raison du personnel supplémentaire nécessité par la croissance de la clientèle et par les

frais de voyages plus considérables occasionnés par la constitution d'un réseau d'institutions. De plus, la dispersion des édifices à l'intérieur de chaque campus nécessite l'augmentation du personnel de direction et de soutien.

Bibliothèques

A ce poste, plus qu'à tout autre, l'Université du Québec se considère comme un "cas particulier" eu égard aux autres institutions de même niveau dans la province. Un comité d'inspection de l'AUCS a constaté la pauvreté quantitative et qualitative des bibliothèques dont a hérité l'Université du Québec des "institutions préalables" et l'a incitée à y remédier au plus tôt.

A cette fonction, elle réclame que la norme prévue par le Conseil des Universités suivant les niveaux soit augmentée de \$50.00 par étudiant au titre du "rattrapage" soit au budget de fonctionnement, soit au budget d'investissement.

Terrains et bâtiments

La répartition géographique des locaux, leur taux d'utilisation et leur vétusté entraînent des dépenses spéciales estimées à \$1,022,000 de plus que la formule du Conseil.

Services aux étudiants

Comme les autres universités, l'U. du Q. propose une contribution plus généreuse du gouvernement, au moins égale à celle attribuée au niveau collégial, soit \$77 par étudiant.

Perfectionnement

L'U. du Q. entend permettre à 59 professeurs de continuer leur perfectionnement entrepris en 1969-70 et se propose d'en libérer 81 nouveaux.

Recherche, INRS, ENAP, Presses

L'U. du Q. fait valoir sa position spéciale en matière de recherche et en ce qui concerne l'INRS et l'Ecole nationale d'administration. A cause de leur création et de l'objectif qu'elles poursuivent (publication de manuels et de rubans magnétiques en langue française, adaptés à notre culture), l'U. du Q. demande que les Presses de l'Université du Québec ne soient pas soumises aux règles de l'autofinancement.

"En résumé, déclare monsieur Riverin, nous nous proposons de recommander au Ministre de l'Education de reconnaître l'Université du Québec comme un "cas particulier" dans son ensemble, que les prévisions budgétaires non prévues par la formule soient transmises telles quelles au Ministre pour analyse et de prévoir un programme de 5 ans de subventions spéciales "d'urgence" pour les unités constituantes de l'Université du Québec."

Université de Sherbrooke

Le document de 18 pages de l'Université de Sherbrooke présenté le 28 janvier 1970 au Conseil des universités fait valoir de nombreux "cas particuliers" pour justifier une augmentation substantielle de la subvention gouvernementale qui lui est accordée.

En 1970-71, sur un budget de fonctionnement de \$13,025,000, l'Université de Sherbrooke se verrait octroyer une subvention de base de \$10,445,300, selon la formule mise au point le 14 janvier par le Conseil des universités.

Compléments à la formule du Conseil

L'Université de Sherbrooke évalue à \$244,000 ses besoins en perfectionnement du personnel, poste budgétaire non inclus dans la formule du Conseil, et à \$125,000 des besoins supplémentaires en matière de recherche. Autre élément non inclus par la formule: une somme de \$8,000 versée à titre de rentes de professeurs pour qui l'université n'avait pu constituer de fonds de retraite. La majeure partie des revendications de l'U. de S. a trait cependant à des "cas particuliers", comme celui de la bibliothèque et du Centre hospitalier universitaire.

Bibliothèque

Ainsi, \$447,000 sont attribuables au déficit à combler au poste budgétaire de la bibliothèque. L'université de Sherbrooke soutient que le cas de sa bibliothèque en est un particulier du fait que le cas de sa bibliothèque en est un particulier du fait que le nombre de ses étudiants à temps complet est passé de 2,082 à 5,402 de 1966 à 1970, que le nombre de ses disciplines et programmes s'est accru, qu'elle n'a investi que \$2.5 millions en achat de livres depuis sa fondation et enfin du fait qu'il lui faut cette année greffer à la bibliothèque un centre de documentation dont le fonctionnement exigera \$50,000. Le budget de la bibliothèque était de \$1,040,000 l'an dernier: l'U. de S. en demande \$1,589,000 cette année. La formule ne lui accorde que \$1,142,000, ce qui, soutient-elle, ne serait même pas suffisant pour couvrir l'augmentation des salaires et des prix.

Centre hospitalier universitaire

Autre cas particulier à l'Université de Sherbrooke: la faculté de Médecine. Cette dernière ne peut compter que sur 40 professeurs à temps partiel pour l'enseignement clinique

alors que les autres facultés de médecine peuvent en compter jusqu'à 350; il n'existe pas à Sherbrooke ces nombreux instituts et cliniques auxquels on a accès à Montréal; enfin Sherbrooke est la seule faculté qui ait conservé son cours en quatre ans.

"La formule est difficilement applicable chez nous puisque nos étudiants sont en clinique dès la première année et que l'hôpital universitaire exige le même investissement en nombre de professeurs, que nous ayons 26,48 ou 64 étudiants."

Le mémoire conclut à ce chapitre: "Notre conscience nous oblige à insister sur le danger très grave pour la survie du CHU des conséquences de ce budget. La société a investi \$40 millions dans ce centre... reconnu comme modèle dans plusieurs domaines. Tout ceci doit-il être sacrifié pour une somme d'environ \$231,000 par an?"

Autres cas particuliers

L'Université de Sherbrooke réclame également \$184,995 au poste des services administratifs en raison du prélèvement de ses cadres affectés aux organismes extérieurs et en raison de l'éloignement des centres de décision (Montréal, Québec) qui impose à ses cadres des déplacements qui se traduisent en perte de temps. En outre, l'éducation permanente est encore absorbée par les cadres administratifs.

L'Université de Sherbrooke, d'accord avec les autres universités, souligne l'insuffisance de la formule en ce qui a trait à l'informatique. Elle réclame \$181,290 pour compenser d'une part l'élimination des subventions générales à la recherche accordées jusqu'ici par le gouvernement fédéral et d'autres part l'impossibilité pour elle d'offrir ses services à l'extérieur.

L'U. de S. fait valoir également les carences de son milieu en équipement et en services de loisirs pour réclamer \$135,000 pour son service aux étudiants.

L'action sociale de l'Université à Sherbrooke se manifeste sur le plan culturel: elle reste encore le principal, sinon le seul, animateur. Le déficit prévu du Centre culturel est de \$82,000.

L'éloignement géographique des concentrations urbaines occasionne à l'U. de S. des frais de déplacements qu'elle prévoit être de \$117,650.

Enfin, l'U. de S. a été la première à procéder aux mesures d'intégration de la formation des maîtres au niveau universitaire. Cette politique lui impose des structures de direction et de coordination et des stages qui constituent une charge supplémentaire de \$105,040.

Ecole Polytechnique

Dans son mémoire présenté le 28 janvier au Conseil des universités, l'Ecole Polytechnique estime que la règle d'analyse proposée le 14 janvier 1970 est insuffisante pour réaliser ses objectifs.

"Le nombre d'ingénieurs d'expression francophone au Québec représente seulement 48% du nombre total, alors que 80% de la population est francophone. Considérant en plus l'importance du développement économique et industriel de la province, affirment les dirigeants de Poly, nous croyons qu'il est essentiel qu'on nous donne, même dans une période d'austérité, les moyens d'atteindre les buts que nous nous sommes fixés".

En 1970-71, sur un budget de fonctionnement de \$5,784,100, l'Ecole Polytechnique se verrait octroyer une subvention de base de \$4,924,000, selon la formule du Conseil des universités.

"Il nous fut agréable de remarquer, déclare-t-on, que les règles d'analyse proposées pour 1970-71 sont relativement plus simples que celles des années précédentes, tout en étant plus raffinées. . . Cependant, nous aurions souhaité que ce raffinement d'analyse soit exploité dans toutes les fonctions où ce facteur de considération est important".

Le "raffinement" dont il est question ici est la distinction apportée entre les disciplines dites "sèches" et les disciplines dites "humides". Poly aurait voulu que la distinction fût mieux exploitée principalement aux chapitres de la "masse salariale du personnel enseignant" et des "terrains et bâtiments".

Masse salariale du personnel enseignant

La formule du Conseil établit à 13/1 le rapport étudiants/professeurs, rapport qui, de l'avis des dirigeants de Poly, n'est pas applicable à une Ecole de Génie. Poly explique en effet que ses étudiants reçoivent en moyenne 9% plus d'heures d'enseignement hebdomadaires que ceux des autres facultés de génie de la province et environ 50% de plus que ceux des facultés de Sciences humaines de l'Université de Montréal; on conclut que pour des classes identiques et un même nombre de professeurs et d'étudiants, le professeur de Poly aurait une tâche d'enseignement de 50% supérieure à celle de son collègue des facultés de Sciences humaines. Dans l'hypothèse où la charge d'enseignement reçue par les étudiants des facultés "humides" est 1.5 fois celle des étudiants des facultés "sèches", le rapport étudiants/professeurs des facultés humides devrait être de 10.2 si le rapport est de 13 pour l'ensemble des universités. Le mémoire soumet que le Conseil des universités devrait donc recommander pour Poly un rapport qui ne soit pas supérieur à 10.2 pour l'année 1970-71.

Terrains et bâtiments

Poly, affirme-t-on d'autre part, ne peut s'accommoder de la formule de \$305 par étudiant, car Poly n'est pas un ensemble de disciplines dites "sèches" et "humides" mais une discipline de sciences appliquées qui, par la nature de l'enseignement prodigué, requiert un grand nombre de pieds carrés à cause de ses laboratoires spécialisés. Plusieurs de ces laboratoires contiennent des ameublements, machines et appareils de dimensions considérables affectés à des travaux pratiques qui ne peuvent être faits que par un nombre restreint d'étudiants à la fois. De plus, ces laboratoires requièrent des services généraux comme l'eau, l'électricité, la vapeur, l'air comprimé, le vide, les gaz, etc. qui demandent un entretien soigné et des réparations coûteuses.

"Considérant que le budget des dépenses en cours est de \$789,400, considérant la nécessité d'augmenter le personnel à l'entretien ménager et le coût additionnel d'une installation "Centrex", considérant l'augmentation de l'indice des prix à la consommation et des traitements du personnel en place, nous croyons que notre demande \$887,490 pour l'année 1970-71 est justifiable".

Administration

Un montant additionnel de \$44,810 au budget de la fonction administration, selon le mémoire, est d'autre part essentiel pour remplir divers engagements spéciaux: pensions spéciales, rachat d'obligations, intérêts sur obligations.

Informatique

La règle de \$50 par étudiant au poste "Informatique" serait également insuffisante dans le cas de Poly où tous les étudiants font un grand usage du centre de calcul. L'an dernier la règle était de \$40 et Poly s'était vu attribuer un supplément de \$26 par étudiant. Appliquée au montant total reçu par Poly l'an dernier, l'augmentation de 20% que propose la règle d'analyse accorderait à Poly \$79 par étudiant.

Publicité et information

Poly a constaté que l'accroissement de sa population étudiante est inférieur à celui prévu; le phénomène s'observe également dans d'autres facultés de génie. Pourtant, la population étudiante au niveau collégial augmente et les besoins d'ingénieurs se font de plus en plus grands. Poly prépare une campagne d'information pour les collèges qui entraînera des dépenses de l'ordre de \$40,000.

Perfectionnement

Ce poste n'est étudié que sur la base de représentations particulières au Conseil: l'École Polytechnique signale qu'elle s'est déjà engagée pour \$60,000 et qu'un montant additionnel de \$40,000 lui sera nécessaire dans le cadre de sa politique de perfectionnement.

Génie minier et génie géologique

Ces départements causent des problèmes particuliers étant donné le petit nombre d'étudiants. Il faut quand même, dit-on, en assurer à tout prix la formation, quand on connaît la richesse du sous-sol québécois et la pénurie d'ingénieurs canadiens-français formés pour l'industrie minière. Le développement de ces départements commande un budget spécial de \$71,130.

Université Laval

Dans un mémoire de 15 pages soumis au Conseil des universités le 28 janvier 1970 l'Université Laval exprime sa crainte de voir

ralentir le rythme normal de son évolution, au point que son avenir immédiat soit en danger, par l'application brusque de méthodes nouvelles. Laval demande l'introduction progressive de la formule.

En 1970-71, sur un budget de fonctionnement de \$33,647,800, l'Université Laval se verrait octroyer une subvention de base de \$26,615,000, selon la formule mise au point le 14 janvier par le Conseil des Universités. Or Laval dit prévoir en fait des dépenses au montant de \$33,898,000.

Ce montant exclut le rattrapage dans le secteur de la médecine (\$1,5 million de plus serait nécessaire) et dans celui de la bibliothèque (\$600,000) et exclut l'engagement de personnel nouveau indispensable à l'enseignement des services académiques et administratifs; en tenant compte de ces différents points, on obtiendrait un budget de \$36,798,000.

Commentaires sur la formule

L'Université Laval désire que l'échelle des traitements des professeurs soit établie dans le cadre d'une étude générale des traitements des professeurs de toutes les universités du Québec.

Laval compte un nombre élevé de professeurs par rapport aux autres universités, ce qui serait dû à des circonstances d'ordre historique. On espère que la Commission de la réforme proposera des structures permettant une meilleure intégration des programmes. Pour l'instant, l'application du rapport professeurs/étudiants 1/13 conduit à une réduction.

Au chapitre de l'informatique, Laval soutient que le coefficient utilisé est trop bas et qu'il ne tient pas compte du développement rapide de ce secteur. L'application de la formule lui accorderait \$614,700 alors qu'en 1969-1970 l'Université a déjà consacré \$700,000 à ce poste.

De plus, la formule ne donne rien pour les dépenses d'informatique applicables à l'administration (\$400,000), celles-ci devant être couvertes par l'administration. Or on verra plus loin que les montants accordés au poste "administration" ne courent même pas les augmentations de salaires.

Laval affirme d'autre part que les dépenses d'administration de l'Université par rapport au budget global de fonctionnement se situent entre 4.3 et 4.5% depuis 1967-1968. Comme 71% des dépenses d'administration sont

consacrés aux salaires, le montant d'augmentation obtenu par la formule 1970-71 par rapport à 1969-70 ne sera pas suffisant pour couvrir les augmentations de salaires: aucune allocation ne pourra être faite pour l'informatique.

La subvention est également insuffisante en ce qui concerne les services aux étudiants. La formule accorde à Laval \$307,400 alors qu'en 1968-1969 les dépenses étaient déjà de \$339,000 et que le fonctionnement du Centre d'éducation physique occasionnera des déboursés additionnels de l'ordre de \$300,000. Les cotisations des étudiants devraient être augmentées de \$35 afin de faire face à ces dépenses.

Au total, Laval estime que, si la formule de financement est retenue par le Conseil, son développement sera gravement compromis, voire le rendement de certains services sera diminué.

Complément à la formule

Laval prévoit à ce titre \$133,000 pour l'amortissement de 1/3 des prêts-bourses antérieurs à 1968-1969, ainsi que \$190,000 afin de permettre aux personnes ayant entrepris des études en 1969-70 de les terminer. De l'université désire accorder 38 nouveaux prêts-bourses en 1970-71.

Cas particuliers

Laval fait valoir d'autre part de nombreux cas particuliers. Son nouveau programme d'art dentaire commande un budget de \$252,940; l'arrivée des étudiants est prévue pour 1971-72.

Au chapitre des sciences de l'éducation, Laval assume la responsabilité du Centre pilote du projet Repères dont les dépenses sont estimées à \$150,000.

La supervision des stages d'étudiants du département de service social occasionnera une dépense de \$80,000. Ces dépenses étaient autrefois couvertes par les organismes subventionnés qui recevaient les étudiants. Par suite d'un changement de politique du ministère de la Famille et du Bien-être social, c'est Laval qui devra les assumer.

Laval prévoit enfin un déficit net de \$951,330 dans les cas de la Station agronomique, de la Station forestière, de l'Animalerie et des Presses de l'Université Laval.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS POLITICAL HOT POTATO

by HARRY E. THOMAS

In recent years the annual allocation of operating grants to Quebec universities has been a political hot potato for the Quebec government. Whatever its decisions it has always made somebody unhappy. Usually, one of those somebody has consistently been McGill University.

Essentially, Quebec's problem is based on the following very real and deeply felt issues:

- 1) The Quebec electorate is highly sensitive about the fact that the number of university places per population in the English-language institutions is still substantially greater than in the French-speaking institutions.

In fact, although Quebec is approximately 80 percent French-speaking the number of places available in each group of institutions is approximately equal.

2) Quebec is committed to a policy of "rattrapage" in the development of educational opportunity for French-speaking Quebecers. What this means is that the province's educational goal is to provide equal opportunity for all of its citizens, irrespective of language.

3) The province's English-speaking population, although it supports the principle of "rattrapage", feels its universities

should not be diminished in the process. Their argument is that the proportionately larger numbers of English-speaking people in university indicates the importance the English community has traditionally placed on higher education and its willingness over the years to finance it.

4) French-speaking Quebecers, on the other hand, take strong exception to this argument — with considerable justification in light of the findings of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Even the most moderate critics of the Anglophone's role in Quebec society will

admit that English-speaking Quebecers have controlled the wealth of the province for generations and that this minority has traditionally been more interested in looking after itself than in caring for the greater need of all Quebecers.

5) The English-speaking Quebecer's rejoinder to this is that even if they had wanted to, they couldn't have contributed more than they had done because until the Quiet Revolution of the Sixties, Quebec seemed uninterested in mass higher education for its people. These same people will say that what they achieved up to that time was mostly the result of their own efforts.

6) Overriding all these arguments of course, are the desperate fears of language dominance and cultural assimilation which Quebec faces due to its isolated position as the homeland of French-Canadian culture and language in the midst of English speaking North America. These fears permeate all discussion about how the educational dollar is going to be divided up. The question for Quebec is how can it continue to survive, and (even more importantly) flourish, as a French-Canadian culture and at the same time foster the maintenance of

English educational institutions whose vitality is felt by many to be serious threat in itself to the survival of French Canada.

These are terribly difficult issues to deal with. A long-term solution is going to require immense good faith and understanding on the part of all Quebec citizens. So far, the record shows that Quebec has treated its English-speaking minority groups with a rare sense of tolerance and justice. There are those who claim that this state of well-being can no longer be taken for granted — that there are serious threats to the educational rights of English-language population in the guise of Bill 62. This bill, which intends to reorganize the school system on the Island of Montreal along language lines to replace the existing parochial system, will create a single educational authority. It can only be hoped that leadership on both sides of the Bill 62 issue will have the good sense to work out a solution that will be in the best interests of all, and that they will avoid reaching some kind of compromise that will only serve to create great heartache and impossible problems for future generations of students.

Getting back to the question of university financing, Quebec is hard at work in establish-

ing a workable formula for the allocation of university operating grants. A major step was taken in this direction last year with the establishment of the University Council. It is this body's job not only to work out a suitable financing formula but to place the awarding of grants, both operating and capital, on a systematic and orderly basis.

Too often in the past the universities were left in situations which made proper planning impossible. Those ad hoc arrangements left the universities with no clear idea of what to expect for the forthcoming year. McGill suffered especially under that system.

Hopefully, this year's efforts of the University Council will be the beginning of proper formula financing. The kind of traumas that the universities have been used to in recent years will, again hopefully, be a thing of the past. Nevertheless, the questions remains as to how much the government can afford and whether those problems related to the socio-economic, cultural, and linguistic issues outlined above are going to be solved or not. In that context, McGill will continue to face serious difficulties each time the allocation of government grants arises.

THE 5WS OF UNIVERSITY FORMULA FINANCING

by GLORIA PIERRE

The problem of university financing has been acute, albeit in differing degrees in Canada and the United States for the past few years.

All universities, it has been said, could with little practice properly spend much more money than they do and no government can possibly meet all the demands on the public coffer. This has been and probably always will be a source of some conflict, referred to more recently as "creative tension."

In many jurisdictions these tensions have been lessened by the establishment of an objective method or formula for allocating government grants. In Quebec, where relations between universities and government have at times been less than satisfactory, a formula is being worked on but has not yet been adopted.

Invariably these days those involved in financial negotiations — regardless of the field — cite Ontario as a model for a specific course of action, as for example, in the annual debate on university grants. Reference is usually made to the Ontario formula for operating grants and to the increase in grant amounts in Ontario. It seems appropriate in the context of this issue of the Reporter to comment on these two topics.

Of great concern to universities — and to governments — is the procedure by which government operating grants are distributed and the extent to which this method infringes upon the internal autonomy of the university.

Institutions that depend on public funds for most if not all of their support must realize that they cannot escape accountability for the money they spend. At the same time it is essential to devise a system that allows

for public accountability without destroying the freedom of the university.

The concept of an objective formula for allocating government operating grants has been generally accepted in principle and was strongly recommended by the Bladen Commission in its report on Financing Higher Education in Canada (1965).

While the arguments in favor of formula financing bear a close resemblance, the formulae devised have varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Responsibility for establishing a satisfactory formula has fallen to the respective grants commissions or advisory bodies.

Most, if not all, jurisdictions have a grants commission or advisory committee which serve, in one way or another, as buffers between universities and the respective government. These groups are concerned with the orderly development of higher education and recommending the sums to be allocated.

The Ontario Committee on University Affairs was founded in its present form in December 1964. The Quebec Council of Universities, while established by law in late 1968, did not become operative until either August or September 1969.

The formula for financing used in Ontario was adopted in 1967 after two years of study conducted by a joint committee of the Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario and of the Committee on University Affairs. Judging from an address given by the president of the Quebec Council of Universities, Dr. Germain Gauthier, at the annual meeting of the AUCC in November — excerpts from which will be presented later — work is well underway to develop a formula for Quebec. (The task is not a simple one. The grants to

be recommended for universities for 1970-71 by the Council were based on an interim financing formula, devised in a short time, which may explain why it falls short of meeting certain aims of an objective formula).

The Bladen Commission set forth in great detail the advantages of formula financing, but for the purposes of this brief review, it should suffice to cite the desired objectives of a formula as outlined in the Ontario report on formula financing and as summarized by Dr. Gauthier at the AUCC meeting.

The Ontario report (1967) states that "a properly designed formula will:

a. Buttress the independence of universities by ensuring a basic income to each institution without the ever-closer scrutiny of operating budgets necessarily involved in subjective review.

b. Provide a more certain basis for university planning, give universities maximum incentive for effective management and allow the healthiest kind of competition amongst universities for achievement.

For the universities, these advantages are obvious and compelling. From the standpoint of the Government, the formula adopted provides similar attractions and will.

a. Obviate the necessity of detailed scrutiny of university operating submissions. The granting body can thus turn more of its attention and energy to major questions of overall level of support, the co-ordination of long-range planning, the special needs of new institutions and consideration of support of new or special projects which may not be adequately sustained within the formula system.

b. Provide equitable treatment. Justice not only is, but is seen to be, done.

c. Ensure to private donors that gifts for operating purposes will be an added resource of the university and not a substitute for public support. It must be the purpose of any granting authority to encourage response to university initiatives in seeking extra support from local governments and private sources."

The report cautions against expecting that a formula can meet all contingencies. "The formula, as adopted, cannot provide for all requirements. Special extra-formula grants are required for newer universities and colleges and major new faculty developments until enrolments reach viable levels." In other words, a formula can be useful in determining basic operation income, but when special needs arise, "there is probably no substitute for subjective decision-making."

In discussing the advantages of formulae, Dr Gauthier stated that any system of government financing must aim for certain objectives, among which he cited the following:

a) permit an adequate operation of a network of institutions and an equitable distribution of available funds, taking into account the effort which the state, at the level of higher education, can and must make; b) allow for the greatest number of institutional choices in using funds starting from basic regulations for allocation; c) stimulate the efficiency of the local administration (each university); d) encourage innovation and competition; e) permit the state and the universities to forecast financial needs and available resources as far in advance as possible.

Dr. Gauthier refers elsewhere to university autonomy and one of the recommendations of the Council's Committee on an Interim Financing Formula was: "that the proposed formula apply only to the mechanical computation of the overall government grants for each university and imply no constraint concerning the final distribution of income made available to universities."

The omission of reference to private support coupled with the inclusion of such income in calculating grants for Quebec universities this year calls for comment.

Assuming that the autonomy of the universities is to be respected, it seems to me of great importance that a formula not discourage sources of private giving, be they industry, alumni or other, by considering such gifts as substitutes for public support. It is not enough that there be no direct control over the internal allocation of funds.

At the same time respect for autonomy should not place limits on an advisory committee's proper concern with the orderly development of the programs and faculties of universities. Considering the economic climate and local requirements, a realistic assessment of the aspirations of universities must be made by an objective body. Not only is cooperation between institutions imperative but unnecessary duplication of programs must be avoided.

Another point that calls for comment in discussing the formula concept is the category of special needs. As indicated in the Ontario report above, there is no formula that can satisfy all requirements. In Quebec the need for "rattrapage" and for extraordinary support for the new Université du Québec are examples of special needs. It would certainly be clearer to the public, if an objective formula could be devised for basic operating costs and if special grants allocated for special needs could be listed as such in a column marked "extra-formula" grants.

The Ontario formula seems to be working well. It took some two years to devise and is subject to review on a continuous basis. It has been kept simple. Designated as basic operation income are standard tuition fees for enrolment, or portion thereof counted in the formula calculation, and provincial government grants. Basic operating income is calculated on the basis of approved weighted enrolment, weights running from 1 to 6 for different categories of enrolment.

As was said before, formulas vary and are no doubt affected by the conditions prevailing in any given jurisdiction. In trying to arrive at a formula, a committee must anticipate all reasonable objections and difficulties. Any consideration of different types of formulae leads to certain conclusions, as set forth by Dr. Gauthier in the AUCC speech mentioned above:

We can conclude that: 1) each formula immediately implies a commitment, even if unconscious, as regards the financing of universities; 2) any formula implies an influence more or less conscious and more or less strong on the internal operations of universities; 3) no formula can be at once simple and subtle enough to take into account the complexities of the university; 4) known formulae are not based on strict analysis of the output of universities but on the average analysis of real costs; 5) the analysis of program costs is an indispensable administrative tool that the universities must use, but the tangible consequence of the use of such analyses to determine governmental grants still remains to be seen.

II. Ontario's Financial Problems

In replying to the revised proposed grants as recommended by the Council of Universities, McGill included in its brief of January 1970 the following statement, which was subsequently quoted in the press: "The Ontario Committee on University Affairs in a recent report estimated that annual increases of about 20 per cent would be necessary for the next few years."

What the Ontario committee said, after commenting on forecasts of increased future enrolments - was: "It is fairly easy to see how annual cost increments of well over 20 per cent may arise. It is not as easy to contemplate the compounding of such rates of increases in university grants over a span of several years."

If comparisons are to be made, it is important to note, moreover, that the Ontario committee suggests serious consideration of possible ways to reduce this rate of escalation, none of which are overly attractive. A look at some of the measures suggested might give an indication of the extent of belt tightening required even in Ontario.

To economize, by reallocating resources, rationalizing the effort of the universities, and terminating programs that have outlived their usefulness. While such efforts are essential (and in fact already in hand in varying degrees), the benefits will not be enormous, will take some time to realize, and can be wrung out of the system only once.

To improve productivity, initially and quite easily, by filling 'empty' places in programs that now have less than viable enrolments, and hopefully later through the use of technology. Few of the experiments yet undertaken with educational technology provide attractive cost/benefit evidence. Too often innovations simply involve additional costs with no change in other activities or costs. It is necessary now to think instead in terms of trade-offs and alternatives.

To restrict entry, so that a smaller proportion of students would attend university and available resources might provide for improved relative support for such a smaller intake.

To mobilize other sources in income, as by shifting a significant portion of the burden of cost from the taxpayer to the individual by increasing fees with some appropriate loan system to enable a student to proceed against the prospect of future earnings.

To change the character of university study, as by making a major shift to part-time study.

Or, finally, to allow some significant deterioration in quality.

PRESENTATION BY MCGILL TO THE UNIVERSITIES COUNCIL 29 JANUARY 1970

1. The Abandonment of the 17 November Formula:

1.1 Immediately prior to this meeting with the Universities Council, McGill and other

Quebec universities received documents that summarized the principles used for a new financing formula, the Formula of January 16, and showed how it applied to each institution.

1.2 The reasons for abandoning the 17 Novem-

only surmise that the motives for working out a new formula were:

(a) that the total of grants resulting from application of the 17 November formula

would be, in the view of the Council, too high;

- (b) that the distribution of grants to each university was judged unsatisfactory according to some unstated criteria.

1.3 If we cannot be sure why the changes were made, it is at least possible to show the effects of the substitution of the new Formula of January 16.

1.4 Table 1 compares the total of grants under each formula and their distribution among the main recipients. Figures for the Formula of November 17 are approximate, and based on statements made at a meeting of the Finance Committee of the Conference of Rectors and Principals on December 10.

1.5 All the Quebec universities will undoubtedly agree with McGill that the total amount that would have been proposed to the Government under the Formula of November 17 corresponds much more closely to the real needs of higher education in Quebec than the \$126 million derived from the Formula of January 16. Prime Minister Bertrand's recently expressed hope that during the 1970s Quebec will begin to reap the economic benefits of the investments made in education during the decade of the 1960s will only be realized if Quebec universities are supported at a level that permits them to contribute the research, and the quality and quantity of graduates, that the new decade will require.

A total of \$126 million is clearly inadequate to maintain university standards. Only \$112 million of this amount goes to existing universities. This figure is only 8% above the sum voted last year. The Consumer Price Index will indeed show that inflation accounts for 4.3 of this increase, leaving 3.7% to cover real development. (The Ontario Committee on University Affairs in a recent report to the government estimated that annual increases of about 20% would be necessary for the next few years).

1.6 It is probably the intention of the Universities Council to recommend funds for special cases that will significantly raise the total of grants. But if monies for special cases amount to a sum sufficient to produce a global figure commensurate with University needs, they will constitute so large a fraction of the total that the significance of "formula financing" will be all but lost. If, for example, "special cases" allocations were to bring the total of grants to a minimally acceptable figure like \$160 million, it would mean that 20% of university grants were not determined by formula.

1.7 From the point of view of McGill and the other English language universities, the effect of moving to the Formula of January 16 is a collective loss of \$7.8 million. As Table 2 indicates, no Francophone Quebec university suffers a reduction that is remotely comparable either in absolute or percentage terms.

2. The Major differences between the two formulae:

2.1 The differences between the Formula of November 17 and the Formula of January 16 are the result of two major changes. First, collegial students are taken out of the new formula except for the item "Buildings and Grounds". Secondly, the distinction between students in the 2nd and 3rd cycles and students in the 1st cycle is abandoned, except for library purposes.

2.2 Following this presentation, we will attempt to analyze the impact of these changes under each of the main budgetary headings. However, before we get into detail, we would like to consider these points in a general way.

3. Are the changes in the Formula of January 16 justified?

3.1 The failure to distinguish between the costs of graduate education and those of undergraduate education appears difficult to justify. It may be said, however, that part of the higher cost of graduate studies is met by McGill University's research income. We have always argued, particularly before the Bladen Commission, that this is not the case. We have maintained that research grants do no more than cover the direct and indirect costs of conducting the research so supported. A pilot study currently being undertaken by the Conference of Rectors and Principals, attempts to trace the effects of research income on the operating costs of the Departments of Chemistry and Economics at McGill and at the University of Montreal, and this may, when it is completed, provide some useful data, but we know from our many years of experience that research income does not reduce teaching costs to any note-worthy degree, and we shall be making a further representation on this point later.

3.2 We, therefore, submit to the Conseil that it is quite inequitable and unrealistic to abandon the distinction between graduate and undergraduate costs that was made in the formula of November 17. McGill argued in the December 11 meeting with the Conseil that insufficient weight had been given to this cost difference even in the Formula of November 17. To find that rather than being given greater weight, the distinction is all but eliminated is profoundly disturbing.

3.3 The removal of collegial level students from the determination of all but one item in the formula is also, we submit, illogical, and we shall pursue this point further when we look at the various budget items in detail. The removal of the collegial students also does not conform to our understanding of the financing arrangements from these students as stated in the 3 March 1969 letter from the Minister, item 2:

"Il est pris pour acquis que le coût des nouveaux programmes de niveau collégial donnés par l'Université McGill sera considéré dans l'ensemble des frais de fonctionnement pour la détermination des subventions à l'université."

4. Some Comparisons:

4.1 We have argued thus far the superiority of the Formula of November 17 over that of January 16 on the grounds that it is logical and equitable to include collegial students and to distinguish between graduate and undergraduate costs. In conclusion, we would like to reinforce these arguments by comparisons with practice outside Quebec and comparisons with the past.

4.2 Comparisons outside Quebec:

No Canadian province that uses formula financing to determine university grants fails to distinguish between costs of graduate and undergraduate education. This fact is, we believe, not only a commentary on the general lack of validity of the Formula of January 16, but also a means of judging whether this formula

is fair to McGill. We submit that no formula used or contemplated in Canada, including the Conseil's own Formula of November 17, can do such damage to McGill as does the Formula of January 16. We cannot provide the details to substantiate this comment for Provinces like Alberta and Manitoba, but even our present knowledge of their formulae assures us that this is the case. We can, however, provide figures based on the Ontario formula, and they are presented in Table 3.

It will be noted that in Table 3 the Ontario figures use the income unit for 1968-69, which is certain to be less than that determined for 1970-71. But even on the 1968-69 basis, McGill would have received \$4.5 million more than the sum attributed to it by the Formula of November 17 and \$9.3 million more than that provided by the Formula of January 16.

4.3 Comparisons with the past:

Since the early 1960s McGill has maintained that an equitable system of government grants would ensure that approximately the same number of dollars per student was provided by government to each university. The exception to this rule, would be the special needs of new universities.

4.4 A corollary to this position is the affirmation, supported by actual practice in other North American settings, that private sources of income should be seen as additional to, rather than as a substitute for, government grants. We note, with regret, that revenue from gifts and endowment income, this year as in the past, constitute a subsidy to government rather than to the university to whom these monies were assigned by donors. And we draw attention, once again, to the high probability that these funds will dry up unless government policy changes.

4.5 Our position on this score has never been absolute; however, for we recognize that an exceptional situation exists in Quebec. One university, McGill, receives much more in gifts and endowment income than do all the other universities of the Province put together. We are, therefore, willing now, as in the past, to discuss methods by which the gap in income from private sources amongst universities can gradually be closed. And we recognize that a case may be made during the transition period for special treatment by government of those universities that do not enjoy a significant measure of private support.

4.6 This being so, we have emphasized in the past, not the difference in government grant per student for McGill as compared with the other universities, but the difference in monies available for expenditure per student, taking public, private and fee sources together.

Table 7 shows how McGill has fared, compared with the other two large Quebec universities, in terms of expenditures per student since 1962-63.

4.7 The picture can be given in more detail for a single year, 1969-70, in graphic form. (Graph 1) McGill's total expenditure per student is about \$600 (or 21%) less than Laval and Montreal, and the total contributed to this expenditure by sources other than grants from the government is about \$100 per student (or 16%) higher than the average of Laval and Montreal.

4.8 It has always been our belief that the disadvantage to McGill, represented by these figures, would be greatly reduced if a well-thought-out system of formula financing were

used to determine university revenues. Our hopes were raised when we examined the effect of the Conseil's Formula of November 17, for which the expenditure per student is shown in Table 5.

4.9 These hopes have been dashed by the unprecedented type of formula that has now been devised by the Council in its proposal of January 16.

Table 6 shows that, once again, our expenditures per student will have to be smaller than those permitted to our sister universities of a comparable size and maturity.

We are very concerned that when the final allocation of grants that will include Special Cases as well as Formula Payments is known, McGill will be at an even greater disadvantage.

Student Staff Ratio (excluding Medicine)

The 17 November formula contained as a basic element the recognition of staff effort in relation to the supervision of graduate students. Specifically, it adopted the 2.5 post-graduate students per supervisor suggested in the Spinks Report*. Thus the staff required to look after collegial students (at a ratio of 15/1) and undergraduate students (at a ratio of 12/1) could also supervise 2.5 graduate students each. If there were more postgraduate students than this basic number, an additional staff member was required for each additional 5 postgraduate students. This formula led to student/staff ratios of between 13/1 and 14/1 for the three large universities (Table 1). At the December 11 meeting with the Council, it was recognized that the 17 November formula would produce deterioration in the student/staff ratio for those universities with small numbers of postgraduate students as that small number increased over the year only improving the ratio when the fraction of postgraduates reached about 17% of all students.

At that meeting, it appeared that a compromise formula would be sought, that would produce a more nearly constant ratio of 17/1 until the proportion of postgraduate students reached about 25%.

Now we have the 16 January formula which proposes a ratio of 13/1 for undergraduates, and 13/1 for postgraduate students regardless of their number. And for collegial students, the ratio for McGill lies somewhere between 46/1 and 153/1, depending on how much of collegial subvention is available for staff to handle these students. Mr. McColl's analysis indicates there is no money available for "collegial" staff, so the student/staff ratio for those students is better described as infinite.

Table 11 show the student/staff ratio for the three large universities under the 16 January proposal. The numbers of staff for Montreal and Laval are only approximate: they were deduced by taking the staff numbers approved in the 69-70 Gauthier report and adding to them the additional staff allowed in the 16 January proposal. Clearly the McGill ratio has deteriorated to a ridiculous level, at 16.8/1. The striking fact is that to bring this McGill ratio down to the 12.9/1 of Montreal, McGill would hire 282 more staff members, for an increase in staff of 30%. Put in different terms, if we exclude all 3880 collegial students from the student total, the ratio would become 12.7/1.

*Report of the Commission to Study the Development of Graduate Programmes in Ontario Universities.

TABLE 1
FTE STUDENT/STAFF RATIO
(excluding medicine)

	FTE STUDENTS (excl. medicine)	BY 17 NOV FORMULA staff stu/staff
McGILL	15,887	1231 12.9
MONTREAL	12,652	899 14.1
LAVAL	12,137	868 14.0

TABLE II
FULL TIME STUDENT/STAFF RATIO
(excluding medicine)

	FULL TIME STUDENTS (excl. medicine)	BY 16 JAN FORMULA staff stu/staff
McGILL	15,615	928* 16.8
MONTREAL	11,818	918 12.9
LAVAL	11,176	873 12.8

* 900 positions filled
+ 28 positions committed

Conclusion:

McGill University recommends to the Universities Council that it return to the fundamental principles of its Formula of November 17, i.e.

1) that all but a small proportion of government grants be allocated to universities by formula;

2) that students at all levels, including collegial level, be counted in determining government grants;

3) that appropriate recognition be given to the differences in teaching costs among collegial, first cycle, and second and third cycle students.

We recognize that an integral return to the Formula of November 17 would create difficulties for some universities, and we are prepared both to see some adjustments in the modes of calculating that Formula and the recognition of special cases. We believe, however, that justice can only be done to large, developed universities by building into a financing formula the principles listed above, and that any attempt to abandon these principles will undermine the vital concept of formula financing. For its part, McGill would even be willing to forego claims for its own special cases if it could be assured that the above principles would be fully respected.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF PROPOSED 1970-71
GRANTS BY 17 NOV. and 16 JAN. FORMULAS
(BEFORE SPECIAL CASES)

	17 NOV	16 JAN
McGILL	33.0	28.2
MONTREAL	25.8	25.5
LAVAL	26.8*	26.6
S.G.W.U.	14.4	12.2
SHERBROOKE	9.8	10.4
BISHOPS	2.3	1.4

*Figure corrected from 22.0 by Dean Geoffrion at the January 29 meeting.

TABLE 2
CHANGE IN PROPOSED GRANTS
EFFECTED BY 16 JAN FORMULA
(BEFORE SPECIAL CASES)

	17 NOV FORMULA (MILLIONS \$)	CHANGE FROM 17 NOV (MILLIONS \$)	% CHANGE
McGILL	33.0	-4.8	-15%
MONTREAL	25.8	-0.3	-1%
LAVAL	26.8*	-0.2	-0.74%
S.G.W.U.	14.4	-2.2	-16%
SHERBROOKE	9.8	+0.6	+6%
BISHOPS	2.3	-0.8	-30%

*Figure corrected from 22.0 by Dean Geoffrion at the January 29 meeting.

TABLE 3
ONTARIO FORMULA GRANTS OF 2 YEARS
AGO COMPARED WITH PROPOSED 17 NOV
AND 16 JAN GRANTS
(BEFORE SPECIAL CASES)

	ONTARIO 68-69 (MILLIONS \$)	17 JAN PROPOSED (MILLIONS \$)	16 NOV PROPOSED (MILLIONS \$)
McGILL	37.5	33.0	28.2
MONTREAL	26.3	25.8	25.5
LAVAL	26.8*	22.0	26.6
S.G.W.U.	9.3	14.4	12.2
SHERBROOKE	6.7	9.8	10.4
BISHOPS	0.9	2.3	1.6

*Figure corrected from 22.0 by Dean Geoffrion at the January 29 meeting.

TABLE 4
QUEBEC UNIVERSITIES
OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER FULL
TIME STUDENT
(Dollars)

	62-63	64-65	64-66	65-66	66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70
McGILL	1893	1445	1639	1821	1795	2017	2053	2218
MONTREAL	1950	2096	2216	2534	2609	2818	2882	2983
LAVAL	1881	2000	2075	2350	2461	2500	2547	2635

* Full time equivalent students

TABLE 5
17 NOV FORMULA: EXPENDITURE
PER STUDENT
(BEFORE SPECIAL CASES)

	17 NOV: TOTAL EXPENDITURE ESTIMATED (THOUSANDS \$)	ALL STUDENTS (fte)	EXPENDITURE PER STUDENT (\$)
McGILL	42,855	16,384	2620
MONTREAL	33,242	13,282	2510
LAVAL	33,833	12,887	2625

* Figure corrected at January 29 meeting.

TABLE 6
16 JAN FORMULA: EXPENDITURE
PER STUDENT
(BEFORE SPECIAL CASES)

	16 JAN: TOTAL EXPENDITURE ESTIMATED (THOUSANDS \$)	ALL STUDENTS (FTE)	EXPENDITURE PER STUDENT (\$)
McGILL	38,611	16,384	2360
MONTREAL	32,942	13,282	2480
LAVAL	33,648	12,887	2620

BISHOP'S UNIVERSITY

Excerpts from preliminary brief

Bishop's University received on Friday, January 23, 1970, the new formula, and its results, which the Council of Universities will consider before submitting its recommendations to the Minister of Education on the operating budgets and the operating grants of Quebec Universities for 1970-71. The next day, the University received the telegram from the President of the Council, requesting that we consider the new formula and other matters under ten headings.

The University would like at the outset to indicate the preliminary nature of this presentation: the time allowed did not permit to prepare a full budgetary position and a full philosophical position. Because one and the other are intimately related, the members of the Council will understand that this brief will

touch only on the highlights of the position of Bishop's University and of the consequences of the suggested formula of January 16, 1970.

Basic Grant Formula

Bishop's University cannot agree to the proposed formula, the net effect of which is to grant only \$78,000 more than in 1969-70, in spite of an increased enrolment of the order of 30 per cent. While it is understood that a formula, by definition, does not take into account the several special factors which play an important role in each of the institutions, it cannot be agreed either that a formula should create a problem so difficult of solution that the entire budget of one institution, or several, becomes a special case.

If a detailed analysis of the budget as proposed is carried out, and if the amount granted under the heading of "étudiants équivalents de niveau collégial x \$800" is distributed on a pro-rata basis, the figures of Table I give an indication of the type of financial straight-jacket in which Bishop's University will find itself.

No institution ought to be penalized to such an extent for having accepted in good faith to undertake programmes which the government wanted them to undertake. It is impossible to understand that any institution would put itself in that untenable position.

Further, on points of detail, Bishop's University finds it difficult to believe that the salaried mass for 1970-71 would be inferior by some \$28,000 to the mass of 1969-70. Under present conditions, the student: faculty ratio would decline from 13:1 to 20:1, clearly unbearable conditions even in primary schools.

Finally, under this heading, it seems that an error has cropped up in the application of the formula. The total "collegial student" grant at \$800, is offset by the deduction of full revenues for those same students at \$375. This leaves a clear grant of \$425 per student, rather than \$625, clearly indicated at the bottom of Table IX.

Status of Collegial Students

While the claim of transition and/or disappearance of collegial students from university campuses may be true in the case of French language institutions, the same cannot be said of the English-language universities, and particularly of Bishop's University.

On March 21, 1969, after discussions which had extended over several months within the Comité Mixte, between the Universities and the Direction générale de l'Enseignement supérieur, and finally between the Minister of Education and each of the institutions, it was agreed that the English-language universities would enter into collegial teaching from September, 1969. This agreement was accepted in good faith and indicated the willingness of those institutions to help the government in establishing a single overall Quebec structure in the educational system.

This meant, however, that the English-language post-secondary system accepted to add one year to the traditional pattern, when

the French-language pre-university system was compressing four years into two. In the latter system, independent institutions the CEGEP, were created; but in the former, an entirely new level was added with its own purposes and its own philosophy, in no way resembling what had existed until then in the Universities.

The Ministerial undertaking further guaranteed that "the cost of the new programmes of the collegial level will be considered in the overall operating costs in determining grants for your institution."

It was stressed on several occasions that each institution had a role to play, indeed a social role toward the population of Quebec. Now ten months later, the institutions themselves are expected to pay out of their own resources for that social responsibility.

Insofar as Bishop's University is concerned, 48% of the student population will, in 1970-71, be of collegial level. This is a result of a double change in policy: first, to render the educational service required for the Eastern Townships (Table II indicates the projected enrolment for the next five years); and second, to protect the academic excellence reached by the university proper, as translated in competitive prizes and awards and in admissions to graduate schools throughout the Western World.

The problem of the collegial level is compounded by an excess of 2,500 Montreal area students for whom no place exists at present. Bishop's University is prepared to participate fully in the solution of the impasse, but it must be given the means to do it.

Under suggested conditions, it is evident that no University of a similar size and of a similar nature could possibly exist. Indeed, no university of any language, or distinction, would even consider such an undertaking. It must be pointed out that the suggested formula treats the collegial level student as a pariah and compounds the odiousness of that solution by forcing the university level student to subsidize the collegial or by forcing the institution itself to operate at substantial deficit and to cover this deficit by attacking its endowment and thus preventing forever revenues from remaining stable, that is, by imposing upon the government the necessity of increasing its grants.

No university can change its structure to accommodate what the Minister himself described as a temporary situation: "No more than four generations of students from 1969 onward."

The universities in Quebec cannot escape the reality of their own environment. The English-language institutions are certainly not seeking to do it. This milieu involves the collegial. Otherwise, it may be that the solution is to return to an exclusive university role, with suitable financial means.

Therefore, the collegial student at present in a university environment must be financed at the same level at least as the university student. For the university cannot change its structure and its methods for temporary expedients. Any other level of financing is an injustice, the costs of which must not be expected to be borne by the institution.



EDITOR

Harry E. Thomas

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Stuart Gilman

PRODUCTION

Helen Murphy

PHOTOGRAPHY

Chris Payne

(Unless otherwise credited)

STAFF WRITER

Harvey Mayne

EDITORIAL POLICY

The McGill Reporter has no editorial prejudice. It is open to contributions from anyone on any subject, and is responsible for presenting, concurrently or serially, a balance between points of view.

DEADLINES

Friday before the issue in which the item is to appear. FEEDBACK deadline is Monday.

POSTES CANADA POSTAGE
8¢
10073 MONTREAL

Published weekly by the Information Office of McGill University, 805 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal 110, Quebec, and distributed free of charge to faculty, students, staff (on campus), and Graduates. Off campus, 15¢. Subscription rate, \$5 per year.

INFORMATION OFFICE

Albert A. Tunis, Director; H. E. Thomas, Suzanne Côté, Margot Clark, Tom Perlmutter, Stuart Gilman, Gordon Thompson (Macdonald College), Robert Reid, Einar Vinje, Helen Murphy, and Chris Payne.

